| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary   | Application No.               | Applicant(s)              |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
|  | 10/671,517                    | AKAMA, FUMIO              |
|  | Examiner                      | Art Unit                  |
|  | Ishwar (I. B.) Patel          | 2841                      |
| All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Being allowed</u>  |                               |                           |
| (1) Ishwar (I. B.) Patel.  | (3)                           |                           |
| (2) Matthew E. Mulkeen (Reg. 44,250).  | (4)                           |                           |
| Date of Interview: 21 July 2005  | Time:                         |                           |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  |                               |                           |
| If Yes, provide a brief description:   |                               |                           |
| Part I.  |                               |                           |
| Rejection(s) discussed:  |                               |                           |
|  |                               |                           |
| Claims discussed:  |                               |                           |
|  |                               |                           |
| Prior art documents discussed:   |                               |                           |
|  |                               |                           |
| Part II.   |                               |                           |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet   |                               |                           |
| Part III.  |                               |                           |
| <ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul> |                               |                           |
|  |                               |                           |
|  |                               |                           |
|  |                               |                           |
|  |                               |                           |
|  |                               |                           |
| Bod  |                               |                           |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/   | Applicant's Representative Si | gnature – if appropriate) |
|  | •                             | - ', '                    |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called applicant's representative and asked to amend claim 1 by adding the limitation of claim 2, to place the application in allowable condition. The applicant's argument, regarding claim 2, in response filed on July 6, 2005, found persuasive as the prior art did not disclose the limitations of claim 2," the three layer structure is characterized in that the thickness of the thermosetting adhesive layer is greater than the thickness of the opposing conductive layers, and the thickness of the thermoplastic film is less than 25 micrometer" in conjunction with other claimed limitations. Applicant gave permission to amend the application by examiners amendment.